THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI L.K. ADVANI): (a) Three Central Ministers and one Chief Minister have been chargesheeted in the Babri Mosque demolition case.

(b) The Central Ministers and the Chief Minister have been chargesheeted by C.B.I. under Section 120-B read with 153-A, 153-B, 295, 295-A and 505 IPC. The Central Ministers have also been chargesheeted under Section 147 and 153-A, 153-B, 295, 295-A and 505 read with Section 149 IPC. The Court has not yet framed the charges.

(c) Offences under Section 153-A, 153-B, 295, 295-A and 505 are non-bailable.

(d) All are on bail granted b the trial Court.

Tada Detenues

1542. SHRI RAJUBHAI A. PARMAR:
SHRIMATI VEENA VERMA:

Will the Minister of HOME AFFAIRS be pleased to state:

(a) the number of detenues under the Terrorists and Disruptive Activities (Prevention) Act in each State and Union Territory on the date when TADA was allowed to lapse and on July 1, 1997 and January 1, 1998 and at present;

(b) the reasons for their continued detention; and

(c) the steps taken to review all such cases this year?

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI L.K. ADVANI): (a) A statement showing the number of persons under detention in TADA pases in different States and Union Territories is attached (See below)

(b) and (c) The pending TADA cases are being regularly reviewed by the State Review Committees in the States and by the Central Review Committee as per the directions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court, However, most of these cases are presently pending in the Designated TADA courts and the prerogative of granting bail to the detenues Vests with the Designated TADA Courts. The annexed statement would reveal that there were only 1331 courts. The annexed Statement would reveal that there were only 1331 number of detenues all over the country as on 1st Januarv 1998.

Statement

Sl. No.	Name of State/UT	No. of persons under detection		
		May '95	1st July '97	1st Jan. '98
1	2	3	4	5
1.	Andhra Pradesh	273	19	19
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	3	1	1
3.	Assam	543	58	58
4.	Bihar	67	21	17
5.	Goa	—	Nil	
6.	Gujarat	267	126	126
7.	Haryana	125	13	13
8.	Himachal Pradesh	2	—	—
9.	J & K	1304	449	449
10.	Karnataka	152	56	56
11.	Kerala	—	—	—
12.	Maharashtra	1020	252	252
13.	Manipur	279	6	6
14.	Madhya Pradesh	46	12	12

1	2	3	4	5
15.	Meghalaya	29	—	—
16.	Punjab	319	124	124
17.	Rajasthan	192	22	22
18.	Tamil Nadu	95	24	24
19.	Uttar Pradesh	241	31	31
20.	West Bengal	6	6	6
21.	Chandigarh Admn.	5	Nil	—
22.	NCT Delhi	377	115	115
	Total	5345	1335	1331

Separate Statutory Development Board for Konkan

1543. PROF RAM KAPSE: Will the Minister of HOME AFFAIRS be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government are aware that Maharashtra Legislature had unanimously passed a Resolution on 13.3.89 for creation of a separate Statutory Development Board for Konkan;

(b) whether Government are also ware that the Government of Maharashtra requested Government on 21.4.89 to amend the Constitution for creation of this Board;

(c) whether it is a fact that Government had informed the Maharashtra Government that if Central Government are convinced in two/three years that the Konkan region can better be developed under a separate board, the question can be considered; and

(d) if so, what are the views of Government on the issue of creation of Konkan Development Board?

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI L.K. ADVANI): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) Yes, Sir,

(c) and (d) on 15.1.1997, the State Government was informed that the three Development Boards in Maharashtra, one each for Vidarbha, Marathwada and the rest of Maharashtra had been set up only in 1994 and therefore, it might be too early to consider any alteration in the existing set up, as any new organisational set-up, inevitably takes time to show tangible results. It was further stated that in case it was felt during the next two to three years that the Board for the rest of Maharashtra was not in a position to effectively cater to development requirements of the Konkan region and the Central Government was convinced that the said region could be better developed under separate Board the question of establishing a Development Board exclusively for Konkan could then be considered. The position can be reviewed in due course.

Punjabi as a Second Language in Delhi

1544. SHRI KARTAR SINGH DUGGAL: Will the Minister of HOME AFFAIRS be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact the Union Territory of Delhi has a bill under consideration for declaring Punjabi as its second language which was referred to a Select Committee and is understood to have been cleared sometime ago; and

(b) if so, how long more would punjabis have to wait to receive due recognition of their mother-tongue with which are linked various factors of Delhi's development and now that it is 50 years since they have made it their home?